



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/759,611

01/16/2004

Johann Karner

H60-107 DIV

8162

7590 01/23/2009
NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.
Suite 110
100 Dutch Hill Road
Orangetown, NY 10962-2100

EXAMINER

LUND, JEFFRIE ROBERT

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1792

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/23/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/759,611

Applicant(s)

KARNER ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrie R. Lund

Art Unit

1792

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 November 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The amendment filed November 10, 2008 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: "migrating around".

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 20-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claim 20 includes the limitation "a plasma beam with a maximum density peak which migrates around said plasma beam discharge directional axes along a plane perpendicular to said plasma beam discharge directional axes". This limitation is not supported in the specification. The specification teaches that the maximum density (i.e. density peak) is in the axis A (see paragraphs 5, 11, 45, and 46). Figure 1 clearly

shows that the maximum density is at a distance 0.0. The arguments presented are clear, but raise the question that if the migration of the peak around the axis is known in the art why was the specification not written to fully disclose the migration? All the teaching in the specification has the maximum density on the beam axis. Furthermore, if this element were to be entered, it would not limit the claim because the migration is a function of the type of plasma and would be inherent in any art applied.

The claim 20 also includes the limitation "the DC plasma discharge configuration". This limitation is not supported in the specification. The specification discloses a plasma discharge configuration. It is believed by the Examiner that such a limitation includes DC and RF power sources. Thus, the specification does not teach a DC power source only. If this is not the case then the Applicant must clearly state so and amend the specification to clearly teach that the power source is a DC power source.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 20-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 20 recites the limitation "the DC plasma discharge" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

Art Unit: 1792

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 20, 22, 23, and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamer et al, US Patent 5,753,045, in view of Matsumoto, US Patent 5,340,621.

Karner et al teaches a vacuum treatment installation, comprising: a vacuum treatment chamber 10; a plasma discharge configuration in the chamber; a gas supply configuration 29 for supplying a carbon-, boron-, nitrogen-, hydrogen-, silicon-containing gas to the chamber; the DC plasma discharge configuration having a plasma beam directional axis (A) extending from a hot or cold cathode 14 to the anode 20, the plasma beam with a maximum density peak which migrates around said plasma beam discharge directional axes along a plane perpendicular to said plasma beam discharge directional axis (inherent in the function of the beam between the electrodes); at least

two deposition configuration mounted on support 24 facing each other for establishing a surface to be treated being positioned along a surface 24, said surface being exposed extending along a substantial section of said plasma beam directional axe, each area of said surface being exposed having a distance to the nearest of said plasma beam directional axis which is substantially shorter than said distance between said cathode and anode electrodes; a gas suction configuration 26 connected to the chamber; the gas supply configuration 29 and the gas suction configuration 26 being connected to the vacuum chamber such that a gas flow through the chamber is generated which is substantially parallel to said plasma beam directional axe (A); and a Helmholtz coil arrangement adapted to generate a magnetic field that is substantially parallel to the plasma beam direction axis. (Figure 3) The deposition configuration is stationary with respect to said plasma beam directional axis.

Karner et al differs from the present invention in that Karner et al does not teach: at least two plasma beam discharge configurations, each having a distinct and independent pair of cathode and anode electrodes defining said plasma beam directional axes of said at least two plasma beam discharge configurations being one beside the other and mutually parallel and each generating a plasma beam, the distance between said cathode and anode electrodes of each of said pairs being substantially larger than the mutual distance of said parallel beam directional axes; or the at least one deposition configuration which is exposed to said at least two plasma beams as generated by said at least two plasma beam discharge configurations each area of said surface being exposed having a distance to the nearest of said at least two

plasma beam directional axes which is substantially shorter than said distance between said cathode and anode electrodes of said pairs.

Matsumoto et al teaches a vacuum treatment installation that includes: a vacuum chamber 1 and at least two plasma beam discharge configurations 7, each having a distinct and independent pair of cathode 5 and anode 6 electrodes defining said plasma beam directional axes of said at least two plasma beam discharge configurations being one beside the other and mutually parallel and each generating a plasma beam, the distance between said cathode and anode electrodes of each of said pairs being substantially larger than the mutual distance of said parallel beam directional axes; and the at least one deposition configuration 19 which is exposed to said at least two plasma beams as generated by said at least two plasma beam discharge configurations each area of said surface being exposed having a distance to the nearest of said at least two plasma beam directional axes which is substantially shorter than said distance between said cathode and anode electrodes of said pairs.

The motivation for add the second plasma beam discharge configuration to the apparatus of Karner et al is to increase the density of the plasma as taught by Matsumoto et al. Furthermore, it has been held in *In re Harza* (124 USPQ 378) that the duplication of parts is obvious. (See MPEP 2144)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a second plasma beam discharge configuration to the apparatus of Karner et al as taught by Matsumoto et al.

9. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karner

et al and Matsumoto as applied to claims 20, 22, 23, and 25-31 above, and further in view of Okamoto, US Patent 6,017,396.

Karner et al and Matsumoto et al differ from the present invention in that they do not teach that the deposition configuration is two parallel surfaces between two plasma discharge configurations.

Okamoto teaches a deposition configuration that consists of two parallel surfaces 15 between two plasma discharge configurations 11, 12. (Figures 2 and 3)

The motivation for replacing the deposition configuration of Karner et al and Matsumoto et al with the deposition configuration of Okamoto is to enable the apparatus of Karner et al and Matsumoto et al to process two flat surfaces simultaneously as taught by Okamoto. Furthermore, it has been held that the simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results is obvious (see *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the deposition configuration of Karner et al and Matsumoto et al with the deposition configuration of Okamoto.

10. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karner et al and Matsumoto as applied to claims 20, 22, 23, and 25-31 above, and further in view of David, US Patent 6,015,597.

Karner et al and Matsumoto et al differ from the present invention in that they do not teach that the deposition configuration is configured as a powder capture surface.

David teaches a deposition configuration configured as a powder capture surface

7. (Figure 1)

The motivation for replacing the deposition configuration of Kamer et al and Matsumoto et al with the deposition configuration of David is to enable the apparatus of Karner et al and Matsumoto et al to produce powder products as taught by David.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the deposition configuration of Kamer et al and Matsumoto et al with the deposition configuration of David.

Response to Amendment

11. Applicant's arguments filed November 10, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regard to the 112 1st paragraph rejections were addressed above.

12. Applicant's arguments, filed November 10, 2008, with respect to the 101 rejection have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 101 rejection has been withdrawn.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrie R. Lund whose telephone number is (571) 272-1437. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (10:00 am - 9:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on (571) 272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeffrie R. Lund/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1792

JRL
1/21/08